

CACC MEETING MINUTES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, December 15, 2011
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007



AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-425-3192
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1112#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson
Cathy Clarich
Julie Dybas
Mary Hawkins*
Donald Jacobson
Phillip Knox*
Patrick McGrath
Richard McHattie
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Paul Thomas*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Michael Malone
Rona Newton
Patricia Noland
Rick Rager

GUESTS

Steve Ballance*, *Pima Superior Court*
John Barrett, *Maricopa Superior Court*
Jennifer Gilbertson, *Phoenix Municipal Court*
Lauren Lupica*, *City of Mesa*

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD*
Melissa Hinojosa, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Cyndi Samuel, *ITD*
Jim Scorza, *ITD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

CACC MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order just after 10:00 a.m. He requested members' input regarding the November minutes.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the November 17, 2011, CACC meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.

PACC UPDATE

No PACC meeting has taken place since the last CACC meeting.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH

Staff member Stewart Bruner focused attention on several projects that had their deliverable dates change during the month. The majority were in the e-filing area. He also pointed out that the vendor for AZYAS, Red Cedar, has delivered code that has not yet been implemented and that Jim Price will be reporting on the recent Pima Superior Court e-filing implementation.

RESETTING DATES AND EXPOSING CONFLICT POINTS TO COT

Karl Heckart reintroduced the topic of exposing resource conflict points among projects discussed in general terms last month. The emphasis of this meeting is on case management system (CMS) related conflicts, while next meeting will focus on e-filing and probation project-related conflicts. To set the stage for discussion, Karl summarized the approach to creating scopes of work for the vendor over the life of the contract, the parameters around preventing "scope creep," implications of increasing vendor resources, and the technique of specifying progressive releases of software to enable development to begin before all requirements have been documented. He answered members' questions about various aspects of contracting with AmCad, both past and future, and addressed concerns about gaps in what courts had been promised in the beginning versus what the vendor has delivered.

Renny Rapier, the project manager for the general jurisdiction (GJ) enhancements to AJACS, shared details about the number of resources and skill areas presently on the project for AOC and likely future conflict points for resources as the limited jurisdiction (LJ) effort ramps up. He summarized that AOC has resource constraints downstream of vendor releases, so adding vendor resources would force addition of AOC resources to be effective. To help address resource issues on both sides of the equation, the vendor will only be releasing two major software updates per year. Focus then shifted to the priorities of the GJ Steering Committee for the content of those two releases and whether it makes sense to allocate resources from the LJ effort to speed resolution of GJ issues. Members discussed the degree of unmet expectations that must be addressed in the GJ courts versus the need for speedy replacement of end-of-life CMSs in the LJ courts. Patrick McGrath represented the GJ Steering Committee in asking that long-running GJ issues be resolved and not left on a list until LJ work wraps up.

In response to Judge Pollard's concern as to whether CACC is being asked to make a decision for the COT, Karl provided two options: democratic participation in setting priorities and making recommendations to the COT or having the AOC set priorities. He reminded members that the discussion must also expand from the present "GJ versus LJ" discussion to include e-filing and

probation next month. Value propositions need to be formulated and then evaluated to determine which projects are in the greater interest of the court system as a whole. Some members were interested in learning more details about conflicts and resource limitations from month to month in order to deliver more informed messages to their constituencies.

In summary, Karl proposed that project managers and steering committees focus on spelling out the value propositions for statewide projects to share with CACC next month. Members also mentioned their desire for more dialog, long term, with both AOC staff and project advocates to accomplish the ongoing task of coordinating automation and making informed recommendations to COT.

AZTURBOCOURT-RELATED PROJECT UPDATES

Jim Price, AZTurboCourt Project Manager at the AOC, updated members on the progress of general civil e-filing at Pima Superior Court. Steve Ballance provided a more detailed update on ROAM data cleanup for the central case index and argued that continuing to track the work on the MindMap as a project is not necessary. The pilot of small claims at Maricopa Justice Courts continues to be delayed by OBOL integration, troubleshooting, fixes, and resolution of showstoppers into late January or early February. John Barrett shared that the issue of MCJC's practice of scanning all documents in each case as a single file has not yet been resolved. Rich McHattie elaborated on remaining work for the e-Filing Foundation project. Obtaining sufficient resources remains an issue, placing the March 31 date in jeopardy, but Rich pointed out that the e-Filing Foundation project is not holding back any other e-filing projects.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

Jim Price reported on the success of the recent implementation of the Pima Superior Court e-filing program, the first court on the statewide model that includes both case initiation and subsequent filings. A few issues exist with the implementation, but the "soft" nature of the launch allows time to work out the issues before the volume ramps up.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS

No items of old or new business were raised. The chair encouraged members to obtain plenty of rest over the holidays since January's meeting will be quite lengthy.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 106** of the **State Courts Building** on **January 19, 2012**.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.